

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: May 1 and 8, 2008

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Joyce McKay, Sarah LeVaun Gaulty, Kevin Nyhan, Marc Laurin, Matt Urban, Mark Richardson, Dave Powelson, Mike Dugas, Pete Salo, Pete Stamnas, Steve Liakos, Ram Maddali, Dale O'Connell, Nancy Mayville, Erik Paddleford, NHDOT; Edna Feighner, Linda Wilson, Beth Muzzey, Jim Garvin, NHDHR; Jamie Sikora, Leigh Levine, FHWA; Amy Dixon, LCHIP; Vicki Chase, Jed Merrow, McFarland-Johnson; Bill Rollins, Aaron Lachance, Stantec; Gerard DeCosta, Litchfield Road Agent; Sean James, HTA; Chris Connell, Town of Littleton; Rita Walsh and Chris Baker, VHB; Michael Croteau, SEA; Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Preservation Consultant; Ed Hiller, Andover Historical Society; Alexander Bernhard, Northern Rail Trail; Bob Crichton, Somersworth Housing; Geoff Aleva, Civil Consultants; Lisa Martin, Jennifer Reczek, Quantum Construction Consultants; Bill Gegas, DRED;

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

**Barnstead 15264 (no federal number)
Long Range Transportation Plan
Portsmouth, STP-X-5379(025), 13455
Litchfield, X-A000(566), 14838
Hancock 13778(no federal number)
Ossipee, X-A000(717), 15296
Manchester SP-P1050-I
Laconia, X-A000(349), 14409
Nashua-Hudson 10625S (no federal number)
Manchester Surplus Lands
Littleton, X-A000(298), 14307
Pelham-Windham 13805 (no federal number)
Andover , X-A000(219), 14169
Somersworth, X-A000(341), 14419
Antrim 15255 (no federal number)
Recreational Trails Program
Salem Manchester 10418C**

Thursday, May 1, 2008

Barnstead 15264 (no federal number). Participants: Vicki Chase, McFarland Johnson (vchase@mjinc.com).

McFarland Johnson presented the proposed Welch Road bridge reconstruction project. The project is located on Welch Road in the Town of Barnstead, New Hampshire, southeast of Center Barnstead and just north of NH Route 126. The bridge carries Welch Road over the Little River, and according to the NHDOT bridge inspection report, the existing bridge was originally constructed in 1930 and later rebuilt in 1999. Surrounding land use is all forested land, with no houses or other structures on Welch Road. Welch Road runs generally northeast connecting NH Route 126 (South Barnstead Road) and New Rochester Road, and is a gravel-surfaced roadway with an average travel way width of approximately 20'. Little River is a perennial stream flowing west into the Big River and subsequently into the Suncook River. Because the project will require a DES Standard Dredge and Fill Permit, it will require clearance from impacts to historical resources under Section 106.

It was noted that the bridge itself was not potentially eligible. Edna Feighner asked if there would be any work including staging conducted outside of the right of way for the bridge reconstruction. Vicki Chase responded that there are likely to be temporary construction easements outside of the road right of way. It was recommended that a Phase 1-A archaeological survey be completed for the project before historical clearance can be granted. Should the project remain entirely within the current alignment, no archaeological survey would be necessary. E. Feighner indicated that if no resources were found, an end-of-field letter could be submitted. As long as all necessary archaeology is completed, a "No Historic Properties Affected Memo" can be submitted for signature.

Long Range Transportation Plan. Participants: Leigh Levine and Ram Maddali.

Leigh Levine and Ram Maddali presented the Long Range Transportation Plan to the committee.

The transportation plan is a long-range planning document with at least a twenty-year time horizon. The plan has the following elements:

- Provides for the development and implementation of the multimodal transportation system for the State.

- Considers and includes as applicable, elements and connections between public transportation, non-motorized modes, rail, commercial motor vehicle, waterway, and aviation facilities, particularly with respect to intercity travel.

Includes capital, operational and management strategies, investments, procedures, and other measures to ensure the preservation and most efficient use of the existing transportation system.

References, summarizes, or contains applicable short-range planning studies; management systems reports; emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans; and any statements of policies, goals, and objectives on issues that were relevant to the development of the plan.

May (but is not required to) include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted plan can be implemented, indicates resources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the plan, and recommends any additional financing strategies.

Is consistent with the development of applicable statewide and regional ITS architectures, the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and public transit-human services transportation plans.

In developing and updating the plan, the State provides citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways, and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, providers of freight transportation services and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment.

Public notices and other public information are made accessible in electronic format and on the World Wide Web.

Visualization techniques are employed when describing the transportation plan to the public.

Provisions are made for non-metropolitan local official participation in the development of the transportation plan.

Includes a safety element that incorporates and is consistent with the priorities, goals, countermeasures, or projects contained in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Includes a security element that incorporates or summarizes the priorities, goals, or projects set forth in other transit safety and security planning and review processes, plans, and programs.

Requires cooperation/consultation with MPOs; non-metropolitan local elected and appointed officials; relevant Federal land management agencies; Indian Tribal governments; other agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation; and, related planning activities being conducted outside of metropolitan planning areas and between states.

Includes a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the statewide transportation plan.

The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The discussion shall be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The State may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation.

Linda Wilson noted that DHR's statewide historic resource databases would be helpful for this effort. The next long range planning projects would occur along corridors I-89 and north of Concord along I-93.

Portsmouth, STP-X-5379(025), 13455. Participants: Marc Laurin, Mike Dugas and Sarah Graulty.

M. Dugas described the reductions in the proposed scope of work to lower the costs of the project. No work will occur on Greenleaf Avenue and the reconstruction of US 1 (Lafayette Road) will end at Jarvis Drive, though it will be up to the City of Portsmouth to decide whether it wants to provide funding for the reconfiguration of the "Y" intersection of Greenleaf with Lafayette.

Photographs were reviewed to complete the effects determination for potential impacts to landscaping for several historic properties. The following determinations were made:

NHDHR#	Parcel(s)#	Description	Impacts / Effects Determination
POR0038	19	William Langdon House	Driveway slope impacts pave 5 to 10 feet apron. Gravel remaining impacted driveway area to match existing. Adjacent mature trees (within Bypass ROW) to be avoided. No Adverse Effect.
POR0040	20	John W. Hopley House	Street trees with city ROW may be impacted only if sidewalk is to reconstructed (city decision). No Adverse Effect.
POR0046	27	Capt Banfield/ Samuel Langdon House	Mature trees, stone wall, and granite post to be avoided. No Adverse Effect
Area HS		Hillside Drive District	No impacts to District. District Boundary readjusted by removing Parcel 40. No Adverse Effect.
Area MR		Middle Road District	Minor driveway slope impacts. No trees present. No Adverse Effect

Area IM	96		Sidewalk repaired. No impacts to landscaping. No Adverse Effect.
	100		No impacts. No Adverse Effect.
	202		No impacts to property. No Adverse Effect.
POR0100	193	Seely House	Widening Maplewood Ave Bridge, removing scrubby vegetation/saplings on property and adding retaining wall. Temporary impacts to paved walkway. Granite steps to be avoided. No Adverse Effect. (Determination of the identity of cistern-like feature needed.)
POR0120	191	Cutts Mansion	No impacts to retaining wall and trees. Retaining wall will be provided on the widened Maplewood Ave bridge to allow driveway into adjacent property to remain. Sidewalk to be extended within ROW in front of property. National Register features will not be impacted. No Adverse Effect.
Area RT1BYP		US 1 Bypass District	Removal of 6 bridges (5 replaced), reconstruction of associated roadway & reconfiguration of US 1 junction with Bypass constructing a signalized intersection. Adverse Effect

Discussion of the documentation of the Bypass District ensued. As all the bridges, apart from Woodbury Avenue, are similar, it was determined that the documentation be focused on the best representative bridge. Woodbury Avenue will be documented separately. Information on the Bypass should be made available to the public, possibly through an historical marker (similar to Memorial Bridge, including an aerial of the Bypass), or a brochure at the State Liquor Store or posted on an historic road website. Aerial of the Bypass should be included. HAER should be contacted to see if they want to be provided with the documentation.

Litchfield, X-A000(566), 14838. Participant: Bill Rollins, (William.Rollins@stantec.com / 669-8672-1312) and Aaron Lachance, Stantec; Gerard DeCosta, Litchfield Road Agent.

Mr. Rollins presented an overview of the project and indicated the Town is proposing to construct approximately 1.8 miles of Pedestrian/Bikeway (multi-use path) in two individual segments. Mr. Rollins indicated on a map of Litchfield which segments of the path have been completed and showed the two segments of the path currently being proposed. Construction of these two segments will complete the path from the south end of Town to the north end of Town where the path terminates at Route 3A.

A roll plan of showing each segment of the proposed path was presented with photos appearing on the roll plan showing the existing conditions along the route of the path. A packet of photos matching the photos on the roll plan was supplied to all the committee members for their use while discussing the proposed location of the path along the road.

Mr. Rollins explained that the proposed path would be an 8-foot wide paved path matching the previously constructed segments of the path. The project will not be going outside the right-of-way. Since the Town of Litchfield had the foresight to layout a 75 foot wide right of way, the path can be constructed within the existing right of way and there is no need for easements or land acquisition.

Mr. Rollins explains that there will be minor wetland impacts where the existing road cross culverts are extended where required.

Joyce McKay indicated that there does not appear to be any aboveground impacts, but asked whether the area where the culvert extensions are proposed has been previously disturbed. Mr. Rollins answered that he thought these areas most likely were disturbed but was not entirely sure.

Edna Feighner asked if we had contacted the Division of Historical Resources about the project. Mr. Rollins responded that he had not, assuming we would present the project during the meeting. Ms. Feighner asked if we had a USGS map showing the location of the project. Mr. Rollins responded that we did not but could supply one. Ms. Feighner asked that we send her a USGS map of the project and some information about the depth of ground disturbance during the construction of the road. The committee indicated to Mr. Rollins that all phases of an Archaeological Survey may be required where the culvert extensions are proposed. Mr. Rollins indicated he would send Ms. Feighner a USGS map and information regarding the depth of disturbance during construction of the existing roadway.

Beth Muzzey stated that there are no aboveground concerns and, thus, No Historic Properties Affected.

Hancock 13778(no federal number). Participants: Kevin Nyhan, Ron Kleiner, and Steve Liakos, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, NHDHR.

Kevin Nyhan and Joyce McKay discussed this project. After survey of comparable bridges, it was determined that the subject bridge is eligible for listing in the National Register. There is no Federal funding and no wetlands permit required (i.e. No Federal action). As mitigation, it was agreed that the eligibility form would be completed. It was decided that in the NH Historic Resource Property documentation, Rich Casella should include the history of the rolled wide flange I-Beam and examine why this new technology came to NH so early.

Ossipee, X-A000(717), 15296 Participants: Mark Richardson, Dave Powelson, Nancy Mayville; Jim Garvin, NHDHR; Amy Dixon, LCHIP; and Sean James, HTA.

Whittier Covered Bridge

Sean James, P.E., SECB from Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc. presented an update on the Whittier Covered Bridge along with discussion of upcoming milestones with respect to the project. Relocation of the bridge from its current location to the Route 25 approach was put out to bid and four bids were received. 3G Construction Company was the low bidder at \$152,250.00 and has been awarded the contract for this work. Shoring and relocation plans and calculations were submitted to Hoyle, Tanner for review and also forwarded to the NHDOT and NHDHR. The installation of the temporary shoring for relocation is ongoing with the move planned for late May or early June, depending on the height of the river.

Jim Garvin had examined the shoring and relocation plans and expressed some concern with the stability of the arches during relocation. To prevent further deformation, the arches would need to be lifted from their bottom. S. James indicated that arches would be shored vertically at the center and approximate third points as well as braced laterally. The plans also call for wire rope bracing between the ends of the arches to resist thrust. Stan Graton of 3G Construction has indicated that he may disassemble the ends of the arches so that the bridge does need to be lifted as much as originally planned. S. James will respond to J. Garvin once Mr. Graton has made a final decision on the arches. J. Garvin also emphasized that LCHIP would require the retention of the maximum amount of original material that is possible.

It was noted that the arch ties and deflections would be monitored and adjusted during the lifting of the bridge. The portion of the project would not require more than a week.

J. Garvin also requested a list of all existing changes to the bridge and when they occurred. This table would help guide rehabilitation and should be added to the final report of the project. It would be helpful if these changes were annotated on the existing drawings.

There was some discussion on the future of the project. The construction portion of the bridge relocation is being partially funded through the NHDOT Municipal Bridge Aid program. The rehabilitation of the bridge will be paid for with Town, LCHIP and federal funding through the National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation Program. S. James is hoping to meet with all interested stakeholders at the bridge prior to the start of the rehabilitation design to discuss concerns and limitations of the project. The Town is currently executing agreements for the project and the stakeholder meeting is not expected to happen until July of this year.

It was suggested that stakeholders convene at the bridge for an on-site meeting in the near future. At this meeting, the group will go through what is in place, what is valued, etc.

Manchester- SP-P1050-I (2). Participant: Matt Urban.

The subject parcel located in Manchester was presented to Edna Feighner on May 1, 2008. Feighner did not identify any areas that may be sensitive for archaeological remains at the time. However, to make sure she held onto a color topo map at 1:24,000 scale to use as a reference against her database.

On May 5, 2008, E. Feighner sent Matt Urban an Email that said there were no issues with the pending transfer of this parcel.

Laconia, X-A000(349), 14409. Participants: J. McKay and S. Gaulty (contact Jay Poulin, HEB (jpoulin@hebcivil.com)).

The 4(f) designation for the construction of 1 mile of Phase 1 of the Winnepesaukee-Opechee-Winnisquam (WOW) shared use path on the railroad bed from Main St. in downtown Laconia to the Belmont town line was reviewed. This trail is part of the Concord, Boston and Montreal Railroad, which is eligible for the National Register (TE project). The committee agreed to no adverse effect and the de minimis findings, and Beth Muzzey signed the resulting Municipal Memo. On the Memo, B. Muzzey noted that DHR must agree to the type of fence installed and that the fence must be removable. She suggested that the project look into the type of fence used in Concord along the active rail line by the Grappone Center and Horseshoe Pond. S. Gaulty will coordinate with Jay Poulin at HEB Civil Engineers regarding the fence question.

Nashua-Hudson, 10625S (now 10644) (no federal number). Participants: Dale O'Connell, Nancy Mayville and Erik Paddleford.

Dale O'Connell explained that the Department was planning the removal of solid waste from the "moat" area around the Hazelton Barn on the Benson property. To do this, the contractor will need to access the property on the north side of the barn. He believed that there was space between the barn and the dwelling foundations to the north to permit entry by trucks onto the property. The trucks will need to cross what had been the associated farmyard to reach the moat area.

B. Muzzey suggested defining the access route for the trucks with construction fencing. This route should be sufficiently removed from the barn to avoid associated architectural features including the cupola, which is now on the ground and avoid impact to any archaeological remains. It was agreed that the trucks would move slowly enough that damage by vibration should not be a problem. J. McKay agreed to define the corridor form truck access.

Thursday, May 8, 2008

Manchester Surplus Lands. Participant: Matt Urban.

Hillsborough

SP-P10440-F,

SP-P10440-E

The parcels located in Hillsborough were remnants of the NH 202 bypass. It was determined that these two parcels did not contain archaeologically sensitive areas. . The pending transfers of these properties may proceed.

Warner-Sutton

SP-243-D

The parcel is located on the Warner – Sutton town line off of Rte 103. This parcel has some unique characteristics that are of interest to SHPO. This parcel contains a segment of an abandoned railbed that also appears to have been a location where the train may have frequently stopped to load passengers on and off. There is an increased interest in the potential archeological characteristics of this parcel. In addition, the parcel contains an old cemetery. The Department purchased the land in 1936 from the Morse family. It appears that the family cemetery has been left intact on the parcel. Other unique factors are that it is located within 250 feet of the Warner River, and the parcel is littered with vernal pools that support wood frogs, salamanders, and other vernal obligate species. E. Feighner indicated that the parcels would require all necessary phases of archaeology if transferred.

Littleton, X-A000(298), 14307. Participants: Chuck Connell, Town of Littleton and Rita Walsh and Chris Baker, VHB.

The Redington Street Bridge (also known as the Apthorp Bridge) is on the east side of Littleton over the Ammonoosuc River. The bridge is an example of a High Pratt Truss metal structure, one of sixteen remaining in the state. Formerly the most common of highway bridges, there are now fewer metal truss bridges in the state than covered bridges. The bridge has been unofficially determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; its eligibility ranking of 13 (not eligible) in 1987 was recently re-examined due to the substantial loss of this bridge type since the 1987 evaluation. A Multiple Property Submission for High Pratt Trusses of New Hampshire 1890-1945 is being prepared by the NHDOT and preservation consultant, Rich Casella. The Redington Street Bridge is noted in the MPS document as an eligible property.

The bridge has a federal sufficiency rating of 15.5 (out of 100) and exhibits serious steel deterioration. The width, height, approach and bridge railings are considered inadequate, while its superstructure is judged to be in serious condition. The bridge's load is currently posted to 10 tons, which restricts certain trucks and buses from crossing. Although the bridge has received a series of relatively recent repairs, safety and economic concerns remain. These restrictions are causing significant hardships to nearby industries, residents, and other groups, which need to use this crossing. C. Baker noted that the

bridge was a vital link in that portion of the town for manufacturing concern. He was asked to identify those concerns.

It was noted that VHB would need to give serious consideration to alternatives to its replacement that would result in its rehabilitation/reuse. It was noted that federal funding would involve Section 106 review.

The bridge is currently programmed for replacement through a Municipally Managed project under an agreement between the Town of Littleton and NHDOT. The funding combination is 40% federal, 40% state, and 20% local (Town of Littleton). Chris Baker of VHB and Chuck Connell presented the reasons for replacement to meeting attendees, although everyone acknowledged the first step needs to be consideration of alternatives to replacement. Suggestions for potential review included repair and rehabilitation of the existing bridge for continued vehicle use, retention of the bridge as a footbridge and building a new bridge alongside it, and possible connection of a pedestrian use of the bridge with a trail on the abandoned railroad right-of-way on the south side of the river adjacent to the bridge. Such alternatives were cited for other existing bridges of the same type. Chris Baker noted that the cost of rehabilitating the existing bridge is quite high, and significantly higher than replacement with a new bridge. In addition NHDOT has programmed the project for the replacement costs and additional funds for rehabilitating the existing bridges, for any use, are not currently in the program. Rehabilitation would require, among other elements, removal of lead paint, removal of the deck, stringer and floor beam system, removal of the top and bottom cross bracing, and renovation of the truss members. He also noted, in response to a question regarding materials recycling, that concrete, steel, and asphalt will be recycled where possible. It was noted that costs for alternatives would need to be accurately calculated.

Rita Walsh of VHB presented the findings of a walkover of the project area by VHB's Senior Archaeologist, Carol Weed. C. Weed noted that the south side river valley terrace has been impacted by the railroad and the existing road. No archaeological potential remains. The north side river valley terrace between terrace edge and Washington /Carleton streets is a likely location for archaeological deposits with these exceptions or clarifications:

- The terrace on the **west side** of Redington Street has been impacted by the tennis court, basketball court, and playground. Observations on the terrace bank suggest the terrace was stripped.
- The terrace on the **east side** of Redington Street was impacted by the development of the houses at 127 and 137 Redington Street and the houses on the south side of Carleton Street. The side yard of 137 Redington Street appears to have been recontoured and is unlikely to retain archaeological deposits. The backyards of 137 Redington Street and the Italianate next to 127 Redington are at a slightly higher elevation. If these yards were within an APE (although currently they are not), archeological reconnaissance might need to be conducted to determine if intact soil horizons remain.

Edna Feighner agreed that no Phase IA archaeological survey is needed at this point if the bridge is rehabilitated or the footprint of a new bridge remains in the same place. However, if adjacent areas are impacted, then archaeological investigations may be needed.

Regarding architectural resources, Walsh showed photographs of buildings in the area whose view shed might be affected by the bridge replacement and/or demolition if the bridge were placed in a different location than the current one. Walsh noted that a preliminary assessment of historic district potential in the area by NHDOT noted no historic district potential. NHDHR requested that inventory forms be prepared for every building and structure in project impact area that appears to be over 50 years old. No Project Area form is required. NHDHR also suggested checking the survey of White Mountain Railroad (abandoned right of way to the south).

A public meeting will be held on May 28 in Littleton to describe the project to residents. At this meeting, Rita Walsh will present an overview of the Section 106 process and will describe possible alternatives to replacement. An attachment with a newspaper article regarding this meeting and a fact sheet distributed to attendees is included with these minutes.

Pelham-Windham 13805 (no federal number). Participants: Michael Croteau, SEA (Michael.Croteau@seacon.com) and Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Preservation Consultant.

The Towns of Windham and Pelham are interested in replacing the existing Castle Hill Road Bridge (Bridge No. 072/145) over Beaver Brook. The existing single-lane bridge consists of a single span, timber deck carried by timber stringers supported on mortared rubble stone abutments. The existing bridge is approximately 27 feet in overall length. A study was performed in April 2003 to evaluate the existing timber bridge and possible bridge replacements. The latest DOT bridge inspection report performed September 12, 2007, indicates a failing deck, superstructure and substructure with a sufficiency rating of 24.4%. The National Bridge Inventory Status indicates the bridge is “structurally deficient”. Pictures taken in 2003 at the time of the study were passed around as well as recent photos taken in March 2008. The bridge is currently closed due to flood damage that occurred in May 2006. Because a wetland permit will be needed, the project would be subjected to Section 106.

The original bridge was built around 1920 and since then has had improvements consisting of new steel guardrail and a new deck in 1971, another deck replacement in 1990, and either the addition of new timber beams between the existing timber beams or retrofit of the existing timber beams in place.

The bridge inspection report indicates the existing deck to be cracked and checked with minor decay and wear. The timber stringers were noted to be cracked and checked with decay in several of the top surfaces. Stringers S3 and S4 showed significant cracks and

were noted to be split at the ends. The abutments were characterized as loose, with voids and cracks with missing stones and deteriorating mortar. The existing rail is substandard providing inadequate height, approach length and end treatments. Since the width of the bridge is inadequate and does not permit traffic to cross at the same time, the bridge has been listed as “functionally obsolete”.

As requested from the November 2007 Cultural Resource meeting, the Town hired an Architectural Consultant, Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, to complete an Individual Inventory Form for the existing bridge because it is over 50 years old and has not been evaluated for its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. The results of this report concluded that the bridge is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Progress plans were presented that reflected the proposed bridge replacement and roadway reconstruction. The new horizontal and vertical alignments will closely match that of the existing roadway to reduce impacts to the existing topography and minimize disturbance of the brook and its edge of banks.

Based on the results of the Individual Inventory Form and the historic eligibility, the following key issues were raised and recommended.

- Based on the current historical status, a public meeting should be held with attendance from both the towns of Pelham and Windham in order to present the project and give the community an opportunity to get involved and decide on alternatives for rehabilitation or mitigation. Those invited to the public meeting should be, but not limited to, the Town Historical Societies, Conservation Commissions, Heritage Commissions and the general public. The bridge should be presented as an eligible resource due to its historical significance.
- Edna Feighner suggested that a Phase 1A Archaeological Survey assessment be performed. The Individual Inventory Form suggested that archaeological resources might be within or adjacent to the project area.. A list of qualified consultants can be found on the NHDHR website.
- Once the public, including the Windham/Pelham heritage commissions, has had an opportunity to review the information in a public forum, the Phase 1A survey has been conducted and public input on potential mitigation measures has been evaluated, a follow up Cultural Resources meeting should be scheduled.

Andover , X-A000(219), 14169. Participants: Kevin Nyhan (1553); Ed Hiller, Andover Historical Society; and Alexander Bernhard, Northern Rail Trail.

Kevin Nyhan discussed the effect of this project on the National Register eligible Northern Rail line. Also in attendance were Alex Bernhard and Ed Hiller, both consulting parties. K. Nyhan presented evidence from past projects, as requested by B. Muzzey, that showed when a noncontributing bridge over the Northern Rail was replaced, the project had No Adverse Effect on the district. If a contributing bridge were replaced, it historically had an Adverse Effect on the district.

A. Bernhard and E. Hiller felt that the project, as designed, would not be adverse to the district. Even in light of the information presented, B. Muzzey stated that she previously determined that the project would have an Adverse Effect. This determination was based on the introduction of a new and substantial element to the corridor.

J. Sikora and K. Nyhan questioned this determination and the real effect of a single bridge on the entire Northern Rail line. B. Muzzey indicated that the Department could involve the ACHP. After discussion, the Department will move forward with the Adverse Effect, with mitigation conceptually being mitigation by design, minimization of impacts by avoiding Mary Peter's garden and other railroad features by the selection of the proposed detour, and vibratory monitoring of the store across the road from the depot during construction.

Somersworth, X-A000(341), 14419. Participants: Bob Crichton, Somersworth Housing (bcrichton@somersworthhousing.org; 692-2864-315); Geoff Aleva, Civil Consultants (geoff@civcon.com).

Geoff Aleva started discussion of project with a recap of the previous meeting. He presented the updated plans to the group and asked for questions. The following list of items was discussed and will be addressed prior to returning for further review.

- Masonry Re-pointing and Slate Roofing: No changes required from what is specified on the plans. It was noted that cleaning would proceed with a soft bristle brush and low, 15 PSI and the color and hardness of the mortar would be matched. They will reuse existing slate where possible and acquire needed replacement slate from the original slate company in Saco, Maine.
- Window Replacement: We discussed the requirement for a window survey. Civil Consultants has contacted Steven Decatur of Alton, NH to review and prepare a survey of the existing windows. The survey is scheduled for the week of June 2nd. G. Aleva will supply the report indicating the window evaluation when complete to NHDOT. He presented a sample window from Pella that indicates the type of window replacement design. The Architect series window is solid wood with a color matched vinyl clad exterior. The committee had no issues about using this type of window if the existing windows cannot be restored. L. Wilson suggested that their choice of replacement windows should be guided by the presence of wood sash and true muntins.
- Door specifications will be updated. It is anticipated that the street level doors will be replaced with new doors appropriate for the style. Presently we are looking at specifying a Pella or Andersen Commercial door package. The basement or railroad level existing doors will be removed and repainted. The committee noted that the new doors must clearly be new but referencing the historic style – they should not “pretend to be historic”.

- Interior Bathroom Revisions: We are still working on the final details for the first floor bathrooms since there are clearance issues due to the thick masonry partition walls.

Civil Consultants will provide a window condition report and revised plans when completed. As discussed, this project will not be required for review or presentation back to the full committee. He will submit a full set of draft specifications and plans to DHR for review and comment. Following the completion of a window survey, G. Aleva will submit a No Adverse Effect full memo indicating each issue and resolution. The memo will be signed and returned to G. Aleva who will then put it in the document for FHWA.

Antrim 15255 (no federal number). Participants: Lisa Martin, (lmartin@quantum-cc.com) and Jennifer Reczek (JReczek@quantum-cc.com), Quantum Construction Consultants.

Quantum Construction Consultants, LLC (QCC) attended the cultural resources on May 8, 2008, as a follow-up to present the information requested by the resource committee during the meeting on December 6, 2007. At the December 6, 2007 meeting, it was determined that no surveys are required to take place on adjacent properties, as they will not be adversely affected by the project, but it was requested that an Individual Inventory Form be completed for the existing concrete bridge structure that was constructed in 1914.

QCC contracted with Preservation Company to complete the Individual Inventory Form and the resulting findings were that the bridge is not eligible for listing of the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, the committee confirmed that no historic properties were affected and the structure may be removed.

There was some question as to the need for a categorical exclusion, and the committee recommended that QCC check with Jim Marshall at NHDOT. If a document is necessary, QCC will submit a memo for municipally managed properties for signature and include the memo in their document.

Recreational Trails Program. Participant: Bill Gegas (bill.gegas@dred.state.nh.us).

B. Gegas reviewed with Edna Feighner the archaeological sensitivity of each trail project for the year 2008 grant round, which is funded by FHWA. . Where such impacts will occur, the applicants will hire an archaeological consultant to review the area.

Salem Manchester 10418C. Participants: Marc Laurin, Pete Stamnas, and Pete Salo.

S. Gaulty presented the recent field evaluation by Lisa Mausolf and her of the portion of the M & L Rail Corridor between Symmes Drive and Liberty Lane in Londonderry. Their evaluation determined that this portion of the corridor likely lacked eligibility prior to the work conducted by NHDOT. B. Muzzey concurred with their finding that this portion of the line was not potentially eligible.

P. Salo handed out a plan and discussed the proposed 200foot directional boring option to place a new AT&T conduit under the historic stone box culvert and the new culvert. This will avoid any potential impacts to the stone box culvert that could have occurred by shifting the existing conduit requiring an open trenching adjacent to the culvert. B. Muzzey and L. Wilson agreed that this was a preferable option. As the new culvert will be constructed 12 feet, at its closest point, to the existing culvert, L. Wilson expressed concerns regarding the need to protect the stone culvert and minimize the disruptions to its setting as much as possible. No physical taking of the culvert is to occur. P. Stamnas stated that the construction contract includes language to protect the culvert and does not allow heavy machinery to cross over it. The trail will be restored for recreational use after construction is completed.

B. Muzzey confirmed that since this portion of the corridor is not eligible and the culvert is individually eligible the proposed work would have a No Adverse Effect, provided all precautions are taken to protect the culvert. Prior to the start of construction, J. McKay will identify for the contractor the areas around both this stone culvert and the one located to the east of I-93 that will need to be protected during construction from any impacts. Construction fencing will be erected to delineate these features. M. Laurin indicated that he would stress the need to remain outside the fenced area at the pre-construction meeting and conduct an on-site meeting with the contractor.

****Memos/MOA's:**

Submitted by Sarah LeVaun Gaulty and Joyce McKay